

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action has been carefully considered. The issues raised are traversed and addressed below with reference to the relevant headings and paragraph numbers appearing under the Detailed Action of the Office Action.

We note that the Examiner indicated that our previous response was not persuasive and that in particular the claims were still anticipated by Danielle and Fox. We respectfully submit that this is not the case. Danielle and Fox do not describe a computer system which receives, from a sensing device, indicating data indicative of the request for a document and identity data indicative of an identity of the user.

In addition to this, Danielle does not at any point describe identifying a user account based on identity data and debiting this with the copyright fee.

These distinctions have been clearly set out in our previous responses and yet the Examiner has so far not provided any justification for maintaining the objections, other than to refer to column 9, line 39 to column 10, line 35 and column 11, line 45 to column 12, line 39. This does not describe a sensing device which stores identity data and provides this to the computer system, or debiting a user account based on this data. We therefore are having difficulty responding to the Examiner's objections and respectfully request that if the Examiner is minded to maintain objections, then the Examiner point out where each feature of the claim is explicitly described in the prior art documents, as opposed to merely referring to portions of the documents which are not in any case relevant.

In addition that the Examiner does maintain objections to the independent claims we have also added new dependent claims for the Examiner's consideration which define further distinctions over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and claim rejections have been successfully traversed and addressed. The amendments do not involve adding any information that was not already disclosed in the specification, and therefore no new matter is added. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims 1 to 20, and the application as a whole with these claims, are allowable, and a favourable reconsideration is therefore earnestly solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK



PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762